



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/834,338	04/13/2001	John Christopher Crandall	10004847-1	2405

7590 11/02/2005

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY  
Intellectual Property Administration  
P.O. Box 272400  
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER

NEURAUTER, GEORGE C

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2143

DATE MAILED: 11/02/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

Commissioner for Patents  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

**E MAILED**

NOV 02 2005

Technology Center 2100

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS  
AND INTERFERENCES**

Application Number: 09/834,338

Filing Date: April 13, 2001

Appellant(s): CRANDALL, JOHN CHRISTOPHER

Thomas J. Meaney, Reg. No. 41,990  
For Appellant

**EXAMINER'S ANSWER**

This is in response to the Appeal Brief filed 21 September 2005  
appealing from the Office Action mailed 27 May 2005.

**(1) Real Party in Interest**

A statement identifying by name the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

**(2) Related Appeals and Interferences**

The examiner is not aware of any related appeals, interferences, or judicial proceedings which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

**(3) Status of Claims**

The statement of the status of claims contained in the brief is correct.

**(4) Status of Amendments After Final**

No amendment after final has been filed.

**(5) Summary of Claimed Subject Matter**

The summary of claimed subject matter contained in the brief is correct.

**(6) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal**

The appellant's statement of the grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal is correct.

**(7) Claims Appendix**

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

Art Unit: 2143

**(8) Evidence Relied Upon**

5835768

MILLER

11-1998

**(9) Grounds of Rejection**

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by US Patent 5 835 768 A to Miller et al. This rejection is fully set forth in the final Office Action mailed 27 May 2005.

**(10) Response to Argument**

Regarding Argument 1, the Applicant has argued that Miller does not teach an algorithm for determining which cultural attributes to communicate to the client program. Miller discloses that cultural attributes or "the user's localized information or preference" as shown at column 5, lines 29-31 are embodied within a file known as a "locale" which, on column 5, line 45-47, Miller discloses that each of the files "uniquely define a set of cultural and linguistic standards or preferences" according to a group of six specific "locale categories" which in column 5, lines 25-31 are shown as embodying such features as character mappings and attributes, monetary formatting, numeric data formatting, and date and time formatting. Miller further discloses that such "locale

Art Unit: 2143

categories" shown as an example for the country of Canada "enables the application program to present information or interact with the user, according to Canadian cultural standards". In column 5, lines 48-60, Miller specifically discloses a method for determining which cultural attributes to communicate to the client program wherein the determining is controlled by a system service disclosed as a "set locale" which in column 5, lines 64-66 wherein the "Set locale 40 is used to provide programmable control over the cultural preference processing environment". Miller discloses in column 6, lines 48-50 that "the application program (Examiner's note: the 'client program' as claimed in the instant application) is not required or able to manage the environment setting and must rely on set locale 40 to perform those functions", further showing that the "set locale" and the client program are separate elements.

Turning to the limitation at issue, Miller specifically discloses at column 6, lines 55-60 that "The value of the relevant locale category is then determined...The function applies the formatting rules specified in the locale category object. The formatted data are then presented or processed."

Therefore, the Examiner submits that Miller anticipates this limitation and the rejection should be sustained.

Regarding Arguments 2-4, the Applicant has argued that Miller does not disclose analyzing available or variable GUI parameters of a client application which is embodied in a host interface analyzer means. As shown previously regarding Argument 1 in column 5, lines 13-24 of Miller, Miller discloses that data is presented to the user according to the "locale categories" that control the presentation of data in character, monetary, numeric, and date and time format. Since the claim contains a nominal recitation of analyzing available GUI parameters of a client application and does not specifically recite a specific implementation of a method of analysis or a specific type of GUI or specific rendering of display data to the user, the Examiner interprets this limitation according to the broadest reasonable interpretation as required by MPEP 2111 wherein the analysis of available or variable GUI parameters of a client application *per se* simply requires deciding what GUI parameters are available or are variable in the respect that the parameters are formatted according to the cultural attributes and are presented to a user on a display. As shown in Miller regarding Argument 1, the "set locale" processes data according to the "locale categories" which control the display of data to a user and the "set locale" contains means for determining the value of the relevant locale category as shown in column 6, line 55.

Therefore, the Examiner submits that Miller anticipates this limitation and the rejection should be sustained.

Regarding Arguments 2 and 4, the Applicant has argued that Miller does not disclose communicating selected ethnicity objects or user specific cultural objects to a client application which is embodied in an object communicator means. Miller specifically discloses in column 6, lines 50-51 wherein the client program uses the "set locale" to perform the creation of the ethnicity objects or user specific cultural objects or the "formatted data" according to the "locale categories" as shown in Miller in column 6, lines 52-60. Miller specifically discloses in column 5, lines 40-42 that "The locale mechanism (Examiner's note: the "set locale") provides a means for conveying the user's language or convention preferences to the application in real-time."

Therefore, the Examiner submits that Miller anticipates this limitation and the rejection should be sustained.

Regarding Argument 3, the Applicant argues that Miller does not teach a means for selecting ethnicity objects in response to a determination of variable GUI parameters of an application. As shown previously regarding Arguments 2-4, Miller discloses the determination of variable GUI parameters of an application. Since the claim contains a nominal recitation of selecting

Art Unit: 2143

ethnicity objects and does not specifically recite a specific implementation of a method of selection or a specific type of GUI or specific rendering of display data to the user, the Examiner interprets this limitation according to the broadest reasonable interpretation as required by MPEP 2111 wherein the selection of ethnicity objects *per se* simply requires that the ethnicity objects are selected to be generated according to the GUI parameters. Miller specifically discloses that the ethnicity objects or the "formatted data" according to the "locale categories" are selected during the method of analyzing available or variable GUI parameters of a client application at column 6, line 55, showing that the selection of "locale categories" are based on the GUI parameters that are used to generate the "formatted data" wherein the "formatted data" is subsequently presented to the user.

Therefore, the Examiner submits that Miller anticipates this limitation and the rejection should be sustained.

**(11) Related Proceeding(s) Appendix**

No decision rendered by a court or the Board is identified by the examiner in the Related Appeals and Interferences section of this examiner's answer.

Art Unit: 2143

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections  
should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,

/George Neurauter/

Patent Examiner

Art Unit 2143

Conferees:

David Wiley

*David Wiley*  
RUPAL DITARIA

*David Wiley*  
DAVID WILEY  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

*Rupal D.*  
RUPAL DITARIA  
SPE AU 2143